

**Growth Management Planning Council
Countywide Planning Policies 2011 Update**

Written Comments

My name is Peter Rimbos. I live in the **Rural Area** of Maple Valley. I am a **member** of the **Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council** and serve as it's **Growth Management Committee Chair** and **Transportation Committee Vice-Chair**.

I'd like to thank GMPC Staff for an excellent **Countywide Planning Policies** Final Draft. I request you consider approving it. However, I have two concerns:

1. There are several proposed Amendments to the Final Draft that seek to **Site Urban infrastructure**, such as **Schools and Stormwater Detention Facilities in the Rural Area**.
2. Removal of several good existing CPP policies from the **TRANSPORTATION** chapter.

1. On the mis-siting of **Urban infrastructure**--both **Schools and Stormwater Detention Facilities**--in the Rural Area, I strongly urge you to reject the Lambert and Sternoff Amendments to the Final Draft's **PF-12, -18, and -19, as well as DP-50**. Unfortunately, these proposed Amendments provide unnecessary and detrimental loopholes to important policy provisions that seek to exploit the Rural Area. Such Urban facilities primarily would serve adjacent Urban needs. Such Amendments go against County-established policies for the Rural Area. They summarily should be rejected.

In the Final Draft's **DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS** Chapter I fully support the **Goal Statement**: "*The Rural Area provides a variety of landscapes, maintains diverse low density communities, and supports rural economic activities based on sustainable stewardship of the land.*" I also fully support the following four of its most important policies for the Rural Area:

DP-45: "*Limit growth in the Rural Area to prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, reduce the need for new rural infrastructure, maintain rural character, and protect the natural environment.*"

DP-47: "*Limit the extension of urban infrastructure improvements through the Rural Area to only cases where it is necessary to serve the Urban Growth Area and where there are no other feasible alignments. Such limited extensions may be considered only if land use controls are in place to restrict uses appropriate for the Rural Area and only if access management controls are in place to prohibit tie-ins to the extended facilities.*"

DP-49: "*Prevent or, if necessary, mitigate negative impacts of urban development to the adjacent Rural Area.*"

DP-50: "*Limit new public facilities located in the Rural Area to a size and scale appropriate to serve the Rural Area unless the public facilities are consistent with a rural location, such as a large passive park.*"

In the Final Draft's **PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES** chapter I fully support policies:

PF-12: "*Prohibit sewer expansion in the Rural Area and Resource Lands except where needed to address specific health and safety problems threatening existing structures. If needed, provide such sewer expansion in a manner that does not increase development potential in the Rural Area.*"

PF-18: "*Locate human, community, and educational services and facilities that serve urban populations within the Urban Growth Area, where they are accessible to the populations that they serve. Site these services and facilities in locations that are well served by transit and pedestrian and bicycle networks.*"

2. On **Transportation**, I request the following policies preferably be restored to the **TRANSPORTATION** Chapter of the CPPs or be addressed in the "2012/13 GMPC Work Plan".

Section 3 -- Freeways/Highways/Arterials

**Growth Management Planning Council
Countywide Planning Policies 2011 Update**

Written Comments

FW-22: *"Where appropriate, King County and its cities shall adopt a clear definition of level- of-service and concurrency requirements and establish a consistent process for implementing concurrency, including accountability for impacts for adjacent jurisdictions."*

Section 4 -- Transportation Level-of-Service (LOS)

T-9: *"Level-of-service standards shall be used as a "tool" to evaluate concurrency for long-range transportation planning, development review and programming of transportation investments."*

Section 5 -- Reassessment

T-15: *"Local governments shall work together to reassess regional land use and transportation elements if transportation adequacy and concurrency cannot be met. Should funding fall short for transportation improvements or strategies needed to accommodate growth, the following actions should be considered:*

- a. Adjust land use and level-of-service standards to better achieve mobility and the regional vision;*
- b. Make full use of all feasible local option transportation revenues authorized but not yet implemented;
and*
- c. Work with Washington State Department of Transportation, METRO, and the private sector to seek additional State transportation revenues and local options to make system improvements necessary to accommodate projected employment and population growth."*

Section 7 -- State Transportation Role

T-20: *"Consistent with the Countywide vision, local governments shall coordinate with the State on land use and transportation systems and strategies which affect State facilities and programs."*

T-21: *"State capital improvement decisions and policy actions shall be consistent with regional and Countywide goals and plans. The State shall ensure its transportation capital improvement decisions and programs support the adopted land use plans and transportation actions."*

Once again, please adopt the Final Draft of the CPPs. They are well-researched, provide an excellent path forward, and are needed.

Thank you.

Peter Rimbo
19711 241st Ave SE
Maple Valley, WA 98038
primbos@comcast.net